

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 8-24 are pending in the application, claims 8, 9-12, 15, 18 and 21-23 having been amended herein.

Claims 8-14 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 8-14 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al..

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kyytsonen.

### **Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 8-14 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to claims 8 and 18 for having the language “a slide having a slidable supporting surface” and “a sliding support structure having a slidable support surface,” respectively. The Examiner contended that each of these phrases conveys two slidable elements. Applicant amended claims 8 and 18 to more clearly recite one slidable element. In view of the amendments to Claims 8 and 18 made herein, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph have been overcome.

**Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)/35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kyytsonen. Former independent claim 15 has been amended to be a dependent claim that depends from independent claim 18. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15. Claims 15-17 directly or indirectly depend from claim 18, and thus include all the limitations thereof. Thus, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Kyytsonen has been overcome.

Claims 8-14 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al.. Applicant respectfully traverses these statements.

The claimed invention relates to a reel-up of a web having a reeling means for guiding a web (W) onto a reel spool (11) to thereby form a reel. The reel-up of the present invention also contains a slide (4) having a supporting surface (44) structured and arranged to retain a reel spool (11) thereon. The slide (4) is **structurally distinct** and is **detached** from the reeling means (5) and the slide (4) is **independently movable** relative to the reeling means (5), whereby the supporting surface (44) is movable from a functional vicinity of the reeling means (5) to a vicinity of the bearing surface of the supporting structure (2). The claimed invention also relates to a method for reeling a paper web with a reel-up around a reel spool (R).

Independent claims 8 and 18 have been amended herein to emphasize that the slide (4) is **structurally distinct** and is **detached** from the reeling means (5) and the slide (4) is **independently movable** relative to the reeling means (5).

The references cited in the Office Action do not disclose the apparatus arrangement in accordance with the claimed invention. The prior art references do not disclose a slide having a

supporting surface (44) wherein the slide (4) is **structurally distinct** and is **detached** from the reeling means (5) and the slide (4) is **independently movable** relative to the reeling means (5).

The Examiner contends that Thomas et al. shows a reeling means (19) and a slide (5) having a supporting surface structured and arranged to retain a reel spool thereon, wherein the supporting surface is slidably movable. (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner equates the transport device 5 of Thomas et al. with the slide 4 of the present invention and the drum 19 of Thomas et al. with the reeling device 5 of the present invention.

However, Thomas et al. shows the transport device 5 is **connected** to the drum 19. (Column 5, lines 6-20 and Figures 1-3 and 5-6). Conversely, the claimed invention recites that the slide 4 is **structurally distinct** and is **detached** from the reeling means 5. Since the transport device 5 of Thomas et al. is connected to the drum 19, it cannot be structurally distinct or “**independently movable** relative to the reeling means (5)” as in the claimed invention.

The inventors have discovered that by having the slide 4 separate from the reeling means 5 that it is possible to allow the diameter of the roll to grow freely without the need to for moving the roll on to the fixed supporting structure. However, in Thomas et al. the maximum diameter of the roll is more restricted because the carriage 20 is on the slide 5.

Accordingly, Thomas et al. does not anticipate or teach the present invention and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments it is submitted that the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome and should be removed and the present application should now be

in condition for allowance.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

A petition for a one-month extension of time with the requisite fee is attached herewith. In the event that any other fees are required, the Patent and Trademark Office is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: 

Paul J. Higgins  
Reg. No. 44,152

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.  
1140 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 768-3800